

REMARKS

This amendment, submitted in reply to the Office action dated March 28, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested. Claims 1-22 are all the claims pending in the application.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner requests cancellation of non-elected claims 15-21.

Applicants traverse of the rejection of claim 1 as set forth below. Because claim 1 is generic and allowable for the reasons submitted, the remaining non-elected claims should be rejoined and allowed in the application.

With regard to the Section 112 rejection of claim 6, applicants submit that the Examiner appears to have misread the claim. The claim describes that the film is “reserved”, not “reversed” as the Examiner contends. Reserving the film is consistent with the remainder of the claim recitations and elected claims. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant’s invention relates to image processing including a prescan and fine scan reading of image information. The images are read in the same sequence for both fine scan and prescan in order to expedite the verification of image information and other image processing for each image frame.

The cited art, Jamzadeh relates to a first prescan operation that precedes a high resolution scan. The reference noted the large volume of information necessary to store a high resolution image, and therefore sought to produce an index print using a sparser image data set. See col. 5, lines 53-65 and col. 6, lines 8-22. During a read operation, a scanner (Fig. 3, element S) scans an

original film to produce three color separated signals R, G, B. The signals are input to a framestore 60 via an input line buffer 58. A logic and control unit (LCU) 61 operates through a path controller 62 to control the flow of data in and out of a framestore 60. Col. 5, lines 1-26. The prescan data can also include information about the location and condition of an image frame. Col. 2, lines 53-60. Using the prescan information, the LCU determines whether the content of an image frame would provide an unacceptable print and can program that no print be made of the particular frame. Col. 6, lines 52-59. Subsequent to a prescan, high resolution images can be output through a user selected format. Col. 5, lines 39-47.

The Examiner contends that independent claim 1 is unpatentable over the teachings of Jamzadeh. At pages 3-4 of the detailed action, the Examiner appears to concede that Jamzadeh does not specifically disclose that the forward end of the film is returned to the read and transport path after the first reading is finished. However, the Examiner notes that Jamzadeh teaches a low resolution and a high resolution scan, and also contends that “[n]owhere in the Jamzadeh et al. disclosure states that the images of the plurality of frames are stored and the order of frames is altered after the prescan.” Based on this, the Examiner notes that one skilled in the art would recognize that the frames are read in the same order for both the prescan and high resolution scan. This is purportedly done to keep the positions of the frame the same. Contrary to the Examiner’s contention, the sequence of the first and second readings of the frames need not occur in the same order as the Examiner assumes. This is because Jamzadeh’s prescan also includes information related to frame location and frame condition. Based on this information, some frames can be omitted from the printing operation and the frames that a user selects can be output in a selected format and order. Col. 6, lines 52-59. Accordingly, there is no requirement

that the sequence of frames of the second reading occur in the sequence as in the first reading as claimed.

In Jamzadeh, there is no description how the film after a prescan is transported to the reading position in a scanner again. Further, in Jamzadeh, additional data information (including the location information on a filmstrip) having been obtained when prescanned are used to record the printing images. Accordingly, the high resolution scan need not to be performed in the same order with that of the prescan. There is also description that LCU 61 may be programmed to inhibit the printing of the customer's unacceptable images (col.6, lines 54 to 59). Rather, Jamzadeh appears to have higher degrees of freedom in the order of frame processing. Therefore, Jamzadeh teaches away from the present invention and is not directed to the present invention.

Relatedly, because the high resolution images can be output in a format selected by a user, this would indicate that selected images are not output (and thus not input) in a particular sequence. Applicants submit that Jamzadeh teaches the desirability of a degree of freedom in the order of frame processing, and thus actually teaches away from the sequence feature of independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable for at least these reasons.

Moreover, Jamzadeh has no disclosure or suggestion of the feature, "returning the forward end of the film to the read and transport path on the entry or exit side of the read and transport path after the first image reading has been finished" as described in the present invention.

In the present invention, the forward end of the film after the first image reading has been finished is returned to the read and transport path on the entry or exit side of the read and transport path along the different path from the read and transport path, i.e., along the path which does not

contain the image reading position. This feature is clearly distinguished from the conventional transport methods of the film in the conventional scanner, namely, returning the rear end of the film after the first image reading has been finished to the read position in the scanner, or after transporting a film back along the same read and transport path and rewinding the film, then transporting the film again to the reading position in the scanner. This feature is common to both elected claims (Species I) and non-elected claims (Species II).

Applicants submit that claims 2-6 are patentable based on their dependency.

Applicants add claims 23 and 24 to describe features of the invention more particularly.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Peruggi Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: July 28, 2005